

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the final Office Action mailed September 20, 2005, the Examiner had maintained a rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 19 and 29, while indicating that claim 20 was only objected to, with an indication that claim 20 if rewritten in independent form and overcoming the Section 112 rejection in claim 1 would be allowable.

It is first noted that this response is being filed further to papers submitted September 12, 2005, these papers comprising an amendment to the drawing which it is submitted is wholly allowable and raises no new issues, and a paper ensuring that Examiner is aware of all related applications, again raising no new issues.

As the Examiner has indicated that claim 20 would be allowable, the subject matter of claims 19 and 20 is being introduced into claim 1; claims 19 and 20 are being consequently cancelled; and the withdrawn claims 21-26 and the independent set of claims 27-33 are also being cancelled.

It is further noted that, solely for clarity and without intent to change the scope of claim 1, a minor amendment is being introduced in the first two lines of claim 1 so that it refers to "a method of humidifying a process gas stream for delivery to a fuel cell...". This wording is intended merely to clarify the first two lines of claim 1.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims have been put into the allowable order indicated by the Examiner. Further, since the subject matter of claims 19 and 20 has now been introduced into claim 1, it is submitted that this inherently addresses the Section 112 rejection of claim 1. The Examiner had argued that the previous reference to removal of heat with a common coolant supply was incorrect, in that, at least in the preferred embodiment, this was achieved by way of an intermediate fluid. Since this scheme is now recited in claim 1, it is submitted that the 112 rejection can properly be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is understood that no further rebuttal of the rejections based on the prior art is required.

In addition to the amendments to the claims, the summary of the invention section on page 4 is being amended, simply to bring it into alignment with the amended claims. In view of the extensive amendments to the claims to date, many of the statements made in this section were no longer consistent with the claims. Accordingly, effectively paragraphs 11 and 12 have been deleted, and the first paragraph in the summary of the invention section has been amended so that it is a direct counterpart to claim 1. No new matter has been added, and it is submitted that this amendment is wholly allowable.

Early review and allowance are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BERESKIN & PARR

By 

H. Samuel Frost

Reg. No. 31,696

Tel : 416-957-1687